DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 345 CE 061 479

AUTHOR Tibbitts, Felisa
TITLE Private Sector Involvement in the Job Training Partnership Act.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education, Boston.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Adult Programs; Corporate Support; Disadvantaged; Employment Programs; Employment Services; Federal Legislation; *Incentives; *Job Training; Low Income; *Participation; Postsecondary Education; *Private Sector; Program Effectiveness; Remedial Instruction; *School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Unemployment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

The Massachusetts Council on Vocational Education surveyed private sector members of the 15 Regional Employment Boards (REBs) or Private Industry Councils regarding involvement in the Job Training Partnership Act. The survey targeted members of business and industry, but not labor representatives. The rate of return was 41 percent; findings were based on 89 completed questionnaires. The majority of REB members reported some significant involvement with all 15 listed activities, an indication of active and effective committee work. A high level of involvement reported for contact with the business community contrasted with low participation levels accorded coordination with schools, agencies, and vocational education committees, as well as the practical assistance of providing cooperative work sites. Across all respondents, the overall level of participation was ranked moderately high; respondents estimated the effectiveness of their participation as only slightly lower. A majority of REB members ranked only one barrier as an obstacle: insufficient time. REB members ranked 4 of 12 potential incentives to their involvement in the REB as high incentives; the other 8 were ranked as significant. A slight majority believed the overall impact of the private sector through REBs was satisfactory; almost one-third were dissatisfied with private sector impact. (Appendixes include recommendations and the instrument.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

ED346345

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education

1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Roberts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Prepared by
Felisa Tibbitts, M.P.P., M.Ed., Ed.D. (Candidate)

CE 061419

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Officers:

Laura R. Studen, Chair
Piedad F. Robertson, Vice Chair
Gloria J. Williams, Treasurer
Arthur Osborn, Jr., Secretary

Members:

Thomas M. Belton
Paul Bento
John R. Correiro
Roberta MacPhee
Michael M. Murphy
Peter A. Quigley
Michael J. Savage
William J. Spring
William M. Swanson, Jr.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Preface	3
ABOUT THE SURVEY	4
ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS .	6
PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN SPECIFIC REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARD ACTIVITIES	9
BARRIERS TO PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARDS	11
INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARDS.	12
NECESSITY FOR IMPROVING PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARDS	13
CONCLUSION	16
COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS	17
References	18
Appendix	19

This report, prepared under the requirements of Section 112 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, Public Law 98-524, has been duly submitted as required to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Members of the Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education, which sponsored the survey on Private Sector Involvement in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), would like to express their appreciation to the 15 Service Delivery Area (SDA) directors who shared their membership lists and supported the survey efforts.

We are particularly indebted to those individuals who reviewed earlier drafts of the survey and offered useful suggestions for its improvement. Special thanks to the Regional Office of the National Alliance of Business.

Finally, this report was edited by James L. Green, Executive Director of the Council, and Katharine Roberts, staff Executive Assistant. We would also like to recognize and thank Katharine Roberts for her involvement in every aspect of the survey preparation and mailing.

The efforts of all these individuals contributed to the production of this final report and to our increased understanding about the motivations and practices of private-sector members on Regional Employment Boards (Private Industry Councils) in Massachusetts.

PREFACE

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1982 has continued a long-standing federal commitment to help disadvantaged persons prepare to obtain employment. The legislation works primarily through a locally based program delivery system to provide remedial education, training, and employment assistance to low-income and long-term unemployed youth and adults. A key feature of the JTPA is promoting a leading role for the private sector in all aspects of programs set up under the Act. Another is making the private and public sectors partners in determining how funds are administered and programs managed at the local level. (National Alliance of Business, 1982)

The State Council on Vocational Education is an advisory group established under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-524). This legislation requires the State Council on Vocational Education to evaluate the JTPA system in the Commonwealth on a biennial basis.

In keeping with the Council's past policy, the evaluation conducted focuses on a specific aspect of the Act. This year, due to the Council's intense interest and advocacy for private sector involvement in vocational education and job training, we have concentrated on the public-private sector linkage.

The Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education is required by law to assess and make recommendations relative to private sector involvement in JTPA and to "advise the Governor, the State board, the State job training coordinating council, the Secretary [of Education] and the Secretary of Labor of these findings and recommendations." These recommendations are included in a separate attachment.

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

ABOUT THE SURVEY

New technologies and scientific advances continue to challenge those involved in preparing young people and adults for the job market. In recent years, the private sector has joined educators in voicing their concern regarding the quality of education and job training. The private sector has communicated an increased need for a host of skills ranging from occupational expertise to critical thinking skills.

Private sector representatives provide an important service to job training through participation in Regional Employment Boards (REBs), also known as Private Industry Councils (PICs). Each board, or REB, services one of 15 Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) established by the Governor. These REBs are administered locally by SDA offices and at the state level by the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training. REBs perform many tasks related to the oversight of all federal and state job training and placement programs, as well as employment-related education programs, in their SDAs. These activities include establishing standards and objectives; reviewing and approving plans, grants and programs; and promoting public - private partnerships.(State Council,1989) One of their specific tasks is the "promotion of working partnerships with private employers and client groups in the development, design, and funding" of these programs."

The Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education (hereafter referred to as the State Council) mailed a questionnaire, Private Sector Involvement in the Job Training Partnership Act, to all private sector members of each of the 15 REBs. Although the private sector includes labor representatives as well as members of business and industry, the survey was specifically designed to target only the latter two categories. Membership lists were obtained from the SDA directors through the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training.

One of the goals of the survey was to document the degree of private-sector involvement in the activities mentioned above. The questionnaire did not concentrate on programs or outcomes of committee activities but asked for private sector perspectives on their own involvement.

The survey contained closed-ended questions that asked recipients to rank their level of involvement in a variety of specific committee activities, to rank their overall level of participation and the effectiveness of this involvement, to rate the significance of barriers and incentives to effective involvement in job training, to indicate whether or not they thought the private-sector impact on job training in the State was sufficient and, if not, to suggest in an open-ended manner ways in which it might be improved. (See Appendix A for sample survey.) Some of the content and format of the questions were based on the instruments used in the 1985 Massachusetts Department of Education study on vocational-technical committees and the 1988 study on private sector involvement sponsored by the Illinois Council on Vocational Education. (Mass.DOE, 1985; Illinois, 1988)

The rate of return for the survey was 41% and the report findings are based on 89 confidential, completed questionnaires.* This current State Council report draws exclusively on the results on this survey, with some limited reference to state and national studies. The State Council also drew on these findings in preparing its recommendations.

---

* Of the 250 surveys mailed out, 5 questionnaires, or 2%, were returned by the post office as undeliverable. 101 were returned. Of these, 12% had not been correctly identified as a current or former member of a REB and the surveys were returned incomplete. Discounting the 5 questionnaires that were incorrectly addressed, the rate of return for the survey was 41%.

ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS

Over half of the respondents (52%) had served on a REB for three years or longer, so that they would have had considerable exposure to the operations of their respective committees. Slightly over a quarter of the respondents had served on their committees for less than two years. The vast majority (89%) were still serving on their committees.

Up to one-third of the REB members also serve on related subcommittees such as Workforce Issues, Adult Literacy/ Education, Disabilities, Health Advocacy and Planning*. Twenty percent of the respondents are also members of a local general or program advisory committee for vocational education.** This information points to an active and motivated private sector membership on the REBs.

REB respondents represented a variety of industries, with traditional manufacturing, finance, insurance and real estate accounting for nearly half of all REB members surveyed. The areas of industry represented by the respondents are broken out below:

TABLE 1. AREA OF INDUSTRY

Question: Indicate your primary area of industry by checking one of the following.

25%	Manufacturing (traditional)
20%	Finance, insurance, real estate
12%	Health services
11%	Other †
10%	Transportation, communication, utilities
8%	Technology (manufacturing, services)
6%	Retail trades
5%	Hospitality services, e.g., lodging, food
1%	Construction trades
1%	Agriculture
1%	Social services, e.g., child care, family services

† Other, uncategorizable areas of industry included primarily professionals, such as business and management consultants, lawyers and economic development specialists.

However, these areas of industry represented by the respondents do not resemble closely the projected year 2000 employment distribution for Massachusetts, although some of the categories are not directly comparable. Projections for the year 2000 anticipated a much higher proportion devoted to retail and wholesale trade (24%) and services, such as social and health (31%), for example, and much lower amounts related to manufacturing (16%), transportation et al (5%) and finance et al (6%). (Mass.Department of Employment and Training, 1989). Moreover, extrapolating from the state DET employment categories, we developed a "technology" category that included manufacturing and related services, and estimated the employment projection to be nearly 20% in the year 2000, as opposed to the 8% shown in Table 1.

---

* Each REB is required by law to have a Workforce Issues subcommittee. Other subcommittees are suggested but not mandated.

**A similar result was <u>not</u> found in a sample of vocational education advisory committee members surveyed simultaneously, none of whom listed himself/herself as a member of a REB.

Approximately half of those completing the questionnaire were managers and vice presidents. Professional personnel and owners of small businesses together accounted for an additional third of all respondents. Lowest representation (3% or fewer) was in the occupational positions of technician, labor/trade, agriculture specialist/farmer, supervisor, and sales representative.

TABLE 2. OCCUPATIONAL POSITION*

Question: Please indicate your occupational position by checking one of the following:

51%	Manager, vice president
17%	Professional personnel
15%	Owner of small business
7%	CEO of small business
6%	CEO of large business
3%	Sales representative
1%	Supervisor
1%	Other (Chamber of Commerce)
0%	Technician
0%	Labor/trade
0%	Agriculture specialist/ Farmer
0%	Supervisor

* Percentages total 101% due to rounding of figures.

Almost 60% of the respondents work in organizations that are sizable, with 250 or more employees. Specifically, 36% are employed by organizations with more than 500 employees. Slightly over one-third work in small-size companies that have less than 100 employees. This information, combined with that we know about the occupational positions of those returning the survey, portrays the typical REB member as a middle, or upper-level, manager of a sizable business.

TABLE 3. WORKPLACE SIZE

Question: What is the size of your workplace?

18%	Under 10 employees
16%	10-99 employees
8%	100-249 employees
22%	250-499 employees
36%	over 500 employees
1%	missing/don't know

The typical respondent was a white, nondisabled male. Slightly over one-third of the completed surveys (35%) were filled out by women. Ten percent were filled out by persons with an ethnic minority background; eight percent were filled out by African Americans, one percent by Hispanics and one percent by an American Indian or Pacific Islander. Only one person with a disability completed a questionnaire.

Report findings are presented using the entire pool of respondents. That is, no separate analyses were conducted on the basis of respondent characteristics or workplace characteristics. We believe that although additional investigations might be interesting, they would not assist the State Council in the development of recommendations that would necessarily apply across-the-board to all REBs in Massachusetts.

PERCEPTIONS OF PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT BOARDS

Respondents were asked to rank their level of involvement with 15 specific activities listed in the survey. The majority of REB members indicated that they had some significant involvement with *all* 15 activities, an indication of active and effective committee work.

TABLE 4. PERCEIVED LEVEL OF PRIVATE-SECTOR PARTICIPATION IN REB ACTIVITIES

Question: How significant has your involvement been in the following activities? Please use the scale: 3=very significant; 2=somewhat significant; 1=not significant at all; na=not applicable.

2.27	Setting overall employment and training goals for region
2.26	Increasing the awareness of the business community regarding job training activities
2.25	Determining allocation of funds
2.23	Determining training needs based on labor market demands
2.14	Encouraging equity in RFP, other program selection processes
2.10	Establishing long-term regional priorities for use of funds
2.10	Expanding resources for employment and training in the region
2.08	Overseeing the evaluation of program effectiveness
2.04	Setting policies for Adult Training Programs
2.00	Setting policies for selection of training providers
1.98	Setting policies for Youth Programs
1.96	Targeting services for special populations
1.60	Coordinating programs between schools and agencies
1.54	Working with local vocational education committees
1.53	Providing potential sites for cooperative and other types of work experience

Many of the REB activities naturally relate to review and planning, duties prescribed under authorizing legislation. The ranking of several other activities is particularly interesting. 'Working with local vocational education committees' is accorded a low status, despite the fact that 20% of the respondents indicate they are also a member of such a committee. Contrast the high level of involvement reported for contact with the business community with the low participation levels accorded coordination with schools, agencies and vocational education committees, as well as the practical assistance of providing cooperative work sites. This finding regarding coordination activities is provocative, given the emphasis placed on this priority in state-level policy documents.*

The change from PICs to Regional Employment Boards in 1989 included an expansion of authority over state programs. A question was included in the survey that asked respondents to indicate their level of involvement, and also their effectiveness, in the additional responsibilities of (a) approving State training programs; and (b) reviewing employment- related education programs.

---

* Refer to the Mass. Training and Employment Plan (JTPA), Perkins Vocational Education Act, Mass. State Plan for Vocational Education. See Abt Associates report (Millsap, 1987).

REB members indicated that they had some involvement in these activities (1.88 and 1.99, respectively) and that they felt that their participation to be somewhat effective (1.78 and 1.85). Although REB involvement in these new responsibilities is moderate, participation is at levels lower than most of the other activities listed on the questionnaire. This is not surprising -- perhaps even commendable -- given how recently the REB purview was expanded.

OVERALL PARTICIPATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Across all respondents, the overall level of participation was ranked moderately high, 2.27 on a scale where 1=little, 2=moderate, and 3=high. Respondents separately estimated the effectiveness of their participation, which was only slightly lower than the first figure, at 2.13.

The overall picture is one of significant REB involvement in a variety of employment and training activities.

BARRIERS TO PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REBS

Given the willingness of private-sector members to participate on REBs, it seemed important to gain a better understanding of the perceived obstacles, so that these might be reduced.

The questionnaire asked committee members to rank 15 potential obstacles to their involvement in the REB. Only one barrier was ranked as an obstacle by the majority of respondents: insufficient time. Lack of expertise in issues confronting the region was considered an obstacle by nearly half of those surveyed. Both of these barriers are essentially brought in by the REB members and are not directly related to the committee structure.

TABLE 5. BARRIERS TO PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

Question: Please rank each of the following potential obstacles to your involvement in the REB using the scale: 3=high barrier; 2=some barrier; 1=no barrier; dk=don't know/no response.

2.01	**Don't have sufficient time.**
1.53	Lack of expertise in issues confronting the region.
1.49	Too much paperwork involved.
1.42	Unclear mission.
1.39	Insufficient information provided on employment-related school programs.
1.38	Opportunities for participation infrequent.
1.34	Previous efforts have had little or no impact.
1.33	Differing philosophies.
1.29	Committee membership a formality.
1.27	Not asked to do important things.
1.27	Administrators not receptive to change.
1.21	Inadequate support staff on committee.
1.21	Company places low priority on my involvement.
1.18	Pressure to provide material resources.
1.14	Geographical distance.

Only a minority of the REB members ranked as significant barriers several aspects of the REB that relate directly to committee operations, including the associated paperwork, the lack of clarity in the committee mission and infrequent opportunities for participation. Although these problems were not cited by most of those returning the surveys, this finding does suggest that these obstacles persist within some REBs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REBS

The questionnaire asked committee members to rank 12 potential incentives to their involvement in the REB. Four of these incentives were ranked as *high* incentives by the majority of respondents. All of the remaining eight incentives were ranked overall as *significant* by committee members. Note that the highest ranked incentive related not to employment and training directly but to a general desire to serve one's community.

TABLE 6. INCENTIVES FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

Question: Please rank each of the following incentives to your involvement in the REB using the scale: 3=high incentive; 2=some incentive; 1=no incentive; dk=don't know/no response.

2.78	Contribute to my community.
2.65	Improve the quality of employment and training.
2.58	Enhance the participation of special populations (such as minorities, economically disadvantaged, displaced homemakers and handicapped persons).
2.55	Improve the relevance of job training to workplace needs.
2.46	Help coordinate program services within the region.
2.38	Coordinate and share information with other public agencies and private sector organizations involved in economic development.
2.24	Enhance sex equity in access to all occupations.
2.18	Increase U.S. competitiveness in world market.
2.05	Network with other local businesses.
1.99	Improve relations with local training providers.
1.80	Provide public relations benefit for company or organization.

These incentives also are an indication of the priorities of private sector members. For example, the second-highest-ranked incentive -- related to the overall goals of improving employment and training -- is consistent with the REB activity rated as having the highest participation levels. The low ranking accorded the incentive to 'improve relations with local training providers' concurs with the low participation levels reported for this activity.

However, at least one interesting gap between incentives for participation and actual involvement in activities is evident. 'Enhance the participation of special populations' is among the highest ranked incentives, yet this activity falls near the midpoint on the list of activities with which REB members are involved. This discrepancy suggests that this is one area where REB members might prefer greater involvement.

NECESSITY OF IMPROVING PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN REBS

A slight majority of the REB members (52%) believe that the overall impact of the private sector through REBs is satisfactory. Almost one third (30%) are dissatisfied with private sector impact and the remainder (18%) are undecided.

Several members are optimistic about the impact of REBs on employment and training in the Commonwealth and their potential to increase this effect:

> *[REBs are] fairly impactful but with changes in the MassJobs Council that are currently being developed and the increased oversight of REBs their effectiveness will be enhanced even further. This will lead to even more private sector involvement.*
>
> *The change to the REB structure is excellent. It will take time to develop its potential. We need to stay on that track...*

Many committee members suggested with great detail and thought the ways in which private sector impact might be increased. The most frequently mentioned suggestions were (paraphrased):

- Better communicating the role of REBs to the public
- Increasing the involvement of the private sector (general)
- Clarifying the responsibilities of the REBs
- Recognizing and better utilizing private sector members on the REBs
- Improving coordination between and among programs, agencies and schools

The following selective comments, written in by REB members, relate to these major points:

> *There needs to be much more publicity linking the recognized need for increased emphasis upon education and funding ....with the work with which REBs are involved.*
>
> *Business must wake up to the fact(s) that they must take a leadership role in training and education.*
>
> *The role of the board is unclear -- got more so with move from PIC to REB. No real direction or authority beyond simple oversight of SDA service providing quality. Review of employment training programs with no true authority is a joke. The plethora of narrowly targeted programs with specific funds that cannot be used for actual community needs is a mistake.*

More coordination with state policies. Increased recognition of private sector contribution.

Need a reliable database listing all training programs, agencies and businesses, the people they train, and how cost-effective each program is; Need to consolidate state agencies with shared and overlapping training responsibilities.

[Let] representatives of the private sector participate in the targeting of programs to be funded...[Let] the private sector reps be more involved in policy setting on how the REBs are structured, not only in their area but on state-wide levels...Highlight the importance of the private sector on the board by somehow overcoming the feeling we are there to just rubber stamp policies and programs already decided upon.

I think that [business people involved in the REB] are very tired of allocating money for the same open-ended programs that promise the moon and stars, don't deliver, and put the participant-clients right back into the pool of unemployed the next year. The program operators must be required to sell their ideas to the private sector first.

The remaining recommendations tended to be quite specific and not easily linked with other comments. For example, individual members called for permanent full-time chairs, a roundtable of CEOs, better recruitment of REB members, establishing a one-step employment and training process and other mechanisms for improving the function of committees. Some selective quotes:

If the REB is to function effectively in its ever expanding role, it will need a permanent full-time chair and one or two staff personnel. The job as it is being envisioned is too big to be handled effectively by a middle-level manager on a part-time, if-I-can-find-the-time, basis.

All board members should have specific committee assignments and be held accountable for results....Board members should not serve more than two consecutive terms. They get bored and aren't productive members... Also, you need to recognize board members who perform back through their senior management. Nothing motivated like recognition.

In addition, some concerns raised in the comments related to bureaucratic requirements, REB politics and unhelpful State involvement.

It is my feeling that some people in the private sector may feel that the REBs are political in nature...i.e., assistance on the passage of question 3 in the last election. The REB should not get involved in this kind of matter.

The State bureaucracy is still engaged in far too much political in-fighting, empire-building and wheel-spinning. The result is that when REBs are asked to do so-called reviews of plans and programs these cannot, or at least have not, resulted in one iota of change.

Local and regional involvement has been progressive and effective. State involvement has been misdirected, ineffective and superficial.

The general message is that although REB members feel overall that they have significant impact on employment and training in Massachusetts, there are many ways in which this effect can be qualitatively improved. These changes would be based on improved management and evaluation techniques, increased local autonomy and a more active -- rather than reactive -- role for private-sector members on the REBs.

CONCLUSIONS

- Private sector members are motivated and have multiple incentives for participation.
- Among the respondents, the incentives for participation outweigh the barriers to involvement in REBs.
- In general, members report a moderately high level of participation and effectiveness on REBs and a slight majority feel this impact to be sufficient.
- Within the spectrum of activities with which REB members are involved, review and planning duties rank high. However, relatively low participation levels are reported for coordination with schools, agencies and vocational education committees, priorities highlighted in authorizing legislation.
- 'Enhancing the participation of special populations' is among the highest ranked incentives for participation in REBs, yet falls near the midpoint in the list of activities with which REB members are involved. This may be an area where private sector members would prefer to be more involved.
- Barriers rated as the most significant obstacles are: insufficient time and lack of expertise on issues confronting the region. These constraints are relatively immune to policy directives or changes in REB structures and powers.
- Some respondents ranked as a significant barrier paperwork, the lack of clarity of committee mission and infrequent opportunities for participation, suggesting that committee operations can still be improved for many of the REBs.
- The general message of the written comments is that although REB members feel overall that they have significant impact on employment and training in Massachusetts, there are many ways in which this effect can be qualitatively improved. These changes would be based on improved management and evaluation techniques, increased local autonomy and a more active -- rather than reactive -- role for private-sector members on the REBs.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Council recommends:

1. The membership composition of the Regional Employment Boards (PICs) should correspond more accurately to projected areas of business growth.

2. More diversity should be present in the private sector membership of the Regional Employment Boards. Supervisor and line worker participation could bring to Regional Employment Board decision making a better perspective on the contemporary workplace.

3. The Regional Employment Boards and General Advisory Committees from vocational schools within each Regional Employment Board Service Delivery Area should meet biannually to consider policy and program objectives for the region.

4. Cross-over membership should occur between Vocational Education Advisory Committees and Regional Employment Boards (PICs).

5. The fact that "small" business is underrepresented on Regional Employment Boards should be analyzed. If the incidence of small business involvment does not coincide with the region's business characteristics, efforts should be undertaken to make the Regional Employment Boards more representative.

6. The finding of incipient enthusiasm for Regional Employment Boards' (PICs') participation is countered by an underlying skepticism of whether a private sector member can make a difference. Therefore, Regional Employment Boards (PICs) should receive increased technical assistance, clarification of powers and responsibilities, and simplification of paper flow.

7. To counter the private sector barrier of "insufficient time" to participate in committee activities, adequate staff should be provided the Regional Employment Boards to prepare materials and assure efficiency of meetings.

8. While acknowledging differences between Service Delivery Areas, the Council recommends a follow-up study of the internal operations of the Regional Employment Boards.

9. Measures should be taken to ensure that highly ranked incentives for participation can be fulfilled in practice. Once such steps are taken, these incentives should be used as tools to recruit more business and industry participation.

10. The low participation levels accorded coordination with schools, agencies, and vocational education committees, as well as the provision of cooperative work sites, is of major concern to the Council. Therefore, the Council recommends biannual meetings between the Regional Employment Board State Association, selected superintendents from vocational and comprehensive high schools, and community college presidents to improve working relationships and to assure that the workplace is made part of each student's learning environment.

REFERENCES

Illinois Council on Vocational Education (1988). Private Sector Involvement in Vocational Education: Report 7 (Springfield, IL).

Massachusetts Department of Education, Division of Occupational Education (1985). 1985 Vocational Advisory Committee Survey of Chapter 74 Approved Vocational Programs (Quincy, MA).

Massachusetts Department of Education, Division of Occupational Education (1989). 1989-1990 State Plan for Vocational Education (Quincy, MA).

Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training (1989). Employment 2000: Projections for Massachusetts Employment By Industry (Boston, MA).

Massachusetts Legislature (1988). House Bill 5800. Concerning establishment of REBs and MassJobs Council. (Boston, MA)

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education (1989). MassJobs Legislation: Summaritive Outline. Handout. (Boston, MA).

Millsap, Mary Ann and Nut-Powell, Bonnie (1987). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Vocational Education Systems in Achieving Their Purposes. Study prepared by Abt Associates Inc. (Cambridge, MA).

National Alliance of Business (1982). Explanation and Analysis of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982. (Washington, DC).

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education
SURVEY
PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

The main purpose of this survey is to find out about the effectiveness of private sector involvement in the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs throughout the state. You are among a sample of private sector members who have been selected to fill out the survey. Your cooperation will help ensure that the results are comprehensive and reliable. Your answers are confidential and results will not be reported in any way that can identify you.

a. You have been identified as a current or former member of a Regional Employment Board (REB). Are you <u>now</u> serving or have you in the <u>past</u> served as a member of a REB?

___ Yes. (If so, please complete the rest of the survey.)

___ No. (If not, please do <u>not</u> complete the rest of the survey but <u>do</u> return the survey in the envelope provided.)

I. JTPA Background

1. How long have you been (were you) a member of a Regional Employment Board?

___ 1 year or less ___ 1-2 years ___ 2-3 years ___ 3 years or more

Are you still serving on the REB? Yes No

2. Are you the Chair or Vice-Chair of your REB?

___ Chair ___ Vice-Chair ___ Neither position

3. Please indicate if you serve on any of the following subcommittees.

	Please check if you are...	
_____ Workforce Issues	_____ Chair	_____Vice Chair
_____ Adult Literacy/Education	_____ Chair	_____Vice-Chair
_____ Other (Disabilities, Health Advocacy, Planning)	_____ Chair	_____ Vice-Chair

4. In addition to working with your REB, do you serve on a general or program advisory committee for vocational education?

Yes No

5. Please indicate your occupational position by checking **one** of the following:

___ Owner of small business
___ Supervisor
___ Technician
___ Labor/ Trade
___ CEO of small business
___ Other _____

___ Manager, vice president
___ Professional personnel
___ Agriculture specialist/ Farmer
___ Sales representative
___ CEO of large business

6. What is the size of your workplace?

___ Under 10 employees
___ 10-99 employees
___ 100-249 employees
___ 250-499 employees
___ over 500 employees

7. Indicate your primary area of industry by checking **one** of the following:

___ Health services
___ Manufacturing (traditional)
___ Construction trades
___ Technology (manufacturing, services)
___ Repair services
___ Transportation, communication, utilities

___ Retail trades
___ Hospitality services, e.g., lodging, food
___ Agriculture
___ Personal services, e.g., dry cleaning
___ Social services, e.g., child care, famly serv.
___ Finance, insurance, real estate
___ Other _____

II. Level of Private-Sector Participation and Effectiveness

Please answer questions 8-10 based on your own experience as a member of your Regional Employment Board.

8. Please rate your involvement in the following activities using the scale:
3=very significant; 2=somewhat significant; 1= not significant at all; na= not applicable.

	Significance of Involvement			
	high	some	none	
Setting overall employment & training goals for region	3	2	1	na
Establishing long-term regional priorities for use of funds	3	2	1	na
Determining annual allocation of funds	3	2	1	na
Determining training needs based on labor market demands	3	2	1	na
Setting policies for Youth Programs	3	2	1	na
Setting policies for Adult Training Programs	3	2	1	na
Setting policies for selection of training providers	3	2	1	na
Overseeing the evaluation of program effectivenes	3	2	1	na
Coordinating programs between schools and agencies	3	2	1	na
Providing potential sites for cooperative or other types of work experience	3	2	1	na
Working with local vocational education committees	3	2	1	na
Targeting services for special populations	3	2	1	na
Encouraging equity in RFP, other program selection processes	3	2	1	na
Increasing the awareness of the business community regarding job training activities	3	2	1	na
Expanding resources for employment and training in the region	3	2	1	na

9. What is your overall level of participation with your Regional Employment Board?

3=high; 2=moderate; 1=little; 0=none _____

10. What is the overall effectiveness of your participation in your REB?

3=high; 2=moderate; 1=little; 0=none _____

11. The change from PICs to Regional Employment Boards in 1989 included an expansion of authority over state programs. For example, REBs now approve state training programs and may review and comment on employment-related education programs. As a member of a REB, to what extent have you been involved with these additional responsibilities and how effective has your involvement been?

	high	some	none	
Approval of State training programs				
Level of involvement	3	2	1	dk
Level of effectiveness	3	2	1	dk
Review of Employment-related education programs				
Level of involvement	3	2	1	dk
Level of effectiveness	3	2	1	dk

III. Potential Barriers for Private-Sector Involvement

12. Please rank each of the following potential obstacles to your involvement in the REB using the scale:
3=high barrier; 2=some barrier; 1=no barrier; dk=don't know/ no response.

	high	some	no barrier	
Opportunities for participation infrequent.	3	2	1	dk
Previous efforts have had little or no impact.	3	2	1	dk
Not asked to do important things.	3	2	1	dk
Committee membership a formality.	3	2	1	dk
Don't have sufficient time.	3	2	1	dk
Inadequate support staff on committee.	3	2	1	dk
Pressure to provide material resources.	3	2	1	dk
Too much paperwork involved.	3	2	1	dk
Geographical distance.	3	2	1	dk
Insufficient information provided on employment-related school programs.	3	2	1	dk
Unclear mission.	3	2	1	dk

What are the barriers to your involvement in the REB? *(continued)*
3=high barrier; 2=some barrier; 1=no barrier; dk=don't know/ no response.

	high	some	no barrier	
Administrators not receptive to change.	3	2	1	dk
Differing philosophies.	3	2	1	dk
Company places low priority on my involvement.	3	2	1	dk
Lack of expertise in issues confronting the region.	3	2	1	dk
Other: _____	3	2	1	dk
_____	3	2	1	dk

IV. Potential Incentives for Private-Sector Involvement

13. Please rank each of the following potential incentives to your involvement in the REB using the scale:
3=high incentive; 2=some incentive; 1=no incentive; dk=don't know/ no response.

	high	some	no incentive	
Serves students/ those in need of training				
Improve the quality of employment and training.	3	2	1	dk
Help coordinate program services w/in region.	3	2	1	dk
Enhance the participation of special populations (such as minorities, economically disadvantaged, displaced homemakers and handicapped persons).	3	2	1	dk
Enhance sex equity in access to all occupations.	3	2	1	dk
Serves private sector/ company				
Recruit potential employees.	3	2	1	dk
Improve the relevance of job training to workplace needs.	3	2	1	dk
Provide public relations benefit for company or organization.	3	2	1	dk
Improve relations with local training providers.	3	2	1	dk
Network with other local businesses.	3	2	1	dk

What are the incentives to your involvement in the REB? *(continued)*
3=high incentive; 2=some incentive; 1=no incentive; dk=don't know/ no response.

	high	some	no incentive	
Serves community/ economic development goal				
Contribute to my community.	3	2	1	dk
Coordinate and share information with other public agencies and private sector organizations involved in economic development.	3	2	1	dk
Increase U.S. competitiveness in world market.	3	2	1	dk
Other: _____	3	2	1	dk
_____	3	2	1	dk

V. Recommendations for Improving Private Sector Effectiveness

14. Do you believe that the overall impact of the private sector through REBs is satisfactory?

Yes No Undecided

If not, please describe how private sector impact through REBs might be increased. Please be specific.

VI. Personal Background

15. Gender: (*circle one*) Female Male

16. Please indicate your ethnicity:

___ Black (not of Hispanic origin)

___ Hispanic

___ White (not of Hispanic origin)

___ American Indian or Alaskan native

___ Asian or Pacific Islander

___ other (*please specify*) _____

17. Are you a disabled or handcapped person? Yes No

** Are you willing to be contacted for a follow-up telephone interview or for participation in a focus group meeting to discuss the survey results? Yes No

If yes, please clearly write your name and daytime telephone number below so that we may contact you. Your survey responses will remain confidential.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return it to the State Council on Vocational Education, State House, Room 51, Boston, MA 02133 in the attached, self-addressed, stamped envelope.